

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of GARY J. M. GREEN, also known
as GARY J. M. DOUGLAS-GREEN, JEREMY
ALAN DOUGLAS, KIMBERLY E. GREEN, and
CODY LEE VINTON, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LESLIE GREEN,

Respondent-Appellant.

and

GARY EUGENE DOUGLAS and FREDDIE LEE
VINTON,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED

May 17, 2005

No. 259442

Calhoun Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-004077-NA

Before: Murphy, P.J., and White and Smolenski, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(A) and (E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); MCL 712A.19b(3); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The primary condition that led to the adjudication was respondent-appellant's addiction to crack cocaine and her homelessness. The evidence showed that respondent-appellant shared cocaine with her oldest son and engaged in prostitution to obtain money for drugs. Respondent-appellant did not take steps to correct her problems and did not abide by the case service plans at all. She did not show up for the appointments that were set up for her by petitioner. She indicated no interest in caring for her children and did not show up for any of the court hearings. Although the children were under the legal guardianship of respondent-appellant's mother, respondent-appellant did not take any steps

to help care for the children when her mother began having health problems and difficulty in controlling the children.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Testimony clearly revealed that there was no bond between the children and respondent-appellant. The children did not ask about her. Even respondent-appellant's boyfriend testified that she did not have any interest in caring for the children. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy
/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski